

Remarks

The Applicant does not believe that examination of the response contained herein will result in the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicant, respectfully, requests that this response be entered and that the claims to the invention, kindly, be reconsidered.

The Final Office Action dated June 1, 2005 has been received and carefully considered by the Applicant. Claims 1-68 are currently pending in the present application for invention. Claims 1-34, 36, 37, 39-42, 48 and 55 are rejected by the Final Office Action dated June 1, 2005. Claims 35, 38, 43-47, 49-52, 54 and 56-57 are allowed. Claims 53 and 58-68 are objected to by the June 1, 2005 Final Office Action.

The Final Office Action rejects Claims 9, 10, 16, 30, 31, 48 and 55 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Final Office Action further states that Claims 60, 64 and 68 defines allowable subject matter. The foregoing amendment to the claims has added the limitations of Claims 60, 64, and 68 to independent claims 9, 30 and 55. Claims 60, 64, and 68 have been cancelled by the foregoing amendment. Therefore, this rejection of Claims 9, 10, 16, 30, 31, 48 and 55 is believed to be moot in view of the foregoing amendment to the claims.

The Final Office Action rejects Claims 1-34, 36, 37, 39-42, 48 and 55 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U. S. Patent No. 5,761,301 issued in the name of Oshima et al. (hereinafter referred to as Oshima et al.) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,205,249 issued in the name of Moskowitz (hereinafter referred to as Moskowitz) and U. S. Patent No. 5,607,188 issued in the name of Bahns et al. (hereinafter referred to as Bahns et al.). The Final Office Action objects to Claims 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67 and 68 but states that these claims are otherwise allowable. The foregoing amendment to the claims has added the features of Claims 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67 and 68 to independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 11, 22, 26, 30, 32, 41, 48 and 55. Therefore, Claims 1-34, 36, 37, 39-42, 48 and 55 are believed to be allowable.

The Final Office Action objects to Claims 42 and 66 because they recite the term player instead of recorder. These have been corrected by the foregoing amendment.

Claim 53 is objected to as being a substantial duplicate of Claim 52. The Applicant, respectfully, disagrees. A key is not necessarily a cryptographic key. The term

cryptographic key defines subject matter that is not defined by key alone. Therefore, the Applicant does not concur with the assertions contained in the Final Office Action that Claim 53 is a substantial duplicate of Claim 52.


Claims 53 and 58-65 are objected to as being substantial duplicates of Claims 52, 43, 45, 49, 35, 51, 54 and 56. The Applicant, respectfully, disagrees. Containing and representing are not equivalent terms. Therefore, the Applicant has retained both sets of claims.

Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By




James D. Leimbach, Reg. 34,374

Patent Attorney (585) 381-9983

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted on this date via facsimile transmission to (703) 872-9306 AND addressed to:
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: August 4, 2005



(Signature)